

## REMARKS

Applicant acknowledges the withdrawal of claims 6-9 from further consideration as drawn to a non-elected invention. However, claim 10 was not withdrawn and the indication thereof that it is part of the withdrawn claims is erroneous. Nevertheless, claim 10 has been cancelled and the subject matter thereof incorporated into amended claim 1. The same is true for claim 2 which has been cancelled.

Applicant has concurrently filed an Information Disclosure Statement with the appropriate fee to be deducted from Applicants Deposit Account No. 01-1944, to make of record the official communication from the corresponding foreign patent application in Germany and the references cited therein. None of the references are believed relevant to the invention of the subject application as claimed.

The rejection of claims 1-4 and 10 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite is respectfully traversed.

Based upon the rejection of claims 1-4 and 10 as being indefinite, under 35 USC 112, applicant has amended claims 1 and 3 and has cancelled claims 2 and 10. Claim 1 was amended to adopt all of the suggestions of the Examiner. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-4 and 10 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite should now be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1-4 and 10 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as being non-enabling is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to add a detailed paragraph at the end thereof, consistent with the specification so as to overcome the lack of enablement rejection. No new matter has been added to the amended claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as being non-enabling should now be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable under 35 USC 112, both first and second paragraphs, for the same reasons as given above.

The rejection of claims 1 and 4 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahn (EP 734655), Nagasawa (JP 62-36151) and Ahn (US 5,834,047) and further in view of Human KK (JP 8-176), Hens (EP 462093) and Martorana (WO-78157) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 as amended defines a given combination of ink compositions and processing conditions (temperature at relative humidity) inclusive of ethanol, shellac, carnauba wax, and an edible ink of yellow, red, blue and black. The edible ink composition from claim 10 which has been cancelled, is now defined in claim 1, in which each specific composition for black ink, yellow ink, red ink and blue ink is specified. This method of preparing candy with a printed picture using the edible ink compositions as now claimed is not taught in any of the cited references taken individually or in combination. It does not become obvious to use the arrangement taught and claimed by applicant simply because a multiple number of patents separately teach individual features of the method and that in general edible ink compositions are known to exist. In essence, the Examiner is employing hindsight to determine what is obvious in direct contradiction to 35 UCS 103. For all of the above reasons, claim 1 is deemed patentable over the cited references.

As regards claim 3, the claimed invention does not permit the use n-butyl alcohol and/or iron oxide ( $Fe_2O_3$ ) as is taught in Nippon Elanco KK, JP 1-178564. In the cited reference, n-butyl alcohol is used together with ethyl alcohol to prolong the inks drying time. If ethyl alcohol only were to be used as an edible ink solvent upon pad printing, the ink on the pad would dry before the pad is pressed onto a subject due to the quick drying property of ethyl alcohol. Namely, the quick dry rate of ethyl alcohol dries the ink before carrying an image from the pad to a subject so no one can obtain a desired image clearly. It is known to add n-butyl alcohol to conventional ink compositions for this purpose. In contrast, the subject invention does not use n-butyl alcohol because it is believed to cause irritation of mucous membranes, dermatitis, headache, dizziness and drowsiness and is prohibited as a food additive in many countries.


In addition, the cited reference teaches iron oxide which is generally used as a pigment for rubber, paints, paper and glass due to its high adhesiveness, high stability to heat, light, air and water. It has however been listed as a carcinogenic which can cause benign pneumoconiosis.

Since the subject invention requires the ink to be printed on candy, the potential toxicity of n-butyl alcohol and iron oxide would present serious health implications if included. Instead, the subject invention uses only ethyl alcohol as an ink solvent and aluminum lake as an ink pigment and otherwise controls processing conditions and the amount of the ink components to obtain a clear picture. It is not obvious from the cited references that n-butyl alcohol and iron oxide may be eliminated by the use of an additional amount of ethyl alcohol.

For all of the above reasons, claim 1 and claim 3 as amended are clearly patentable over the cited references, taken individually or in combination. Claims 2 and 10 have been cancelled and claim 4 is a dependent claims which depend from claim 3 and is therefore believed patentable for the same reasons as given above.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 3 and 4 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,




Eugene Lieberstein  
Reg. No. 24,645

ANDERSON, KILL & OLICK  
1251 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10020-1182  
(212) 278-1000

#### MAILING CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450 on March 18, 2004.



Date: March 18, 2004